

# Seeker of Scientific Truth

Volume - I



INNAAIAH NARISETTI

## RATIONALISM

- Philosophical Consequences of Modern Science
- Sane Living
- Spoiling the Children

# **SEEKER OF SCIENTIFIC TRUTH**

**Volume - I**

## **RATIONALISM**

- ◆ Philosophical Consequences of Modern Science
- ◆ Sane Living
- ◆ Spoiling the Child

Innaiah Narisetti

**SEEKER OF  
SCIENTIFIC TRUTH**  
**Volume - I**  
**Rationalism**  
Innaiah Narisetti

Narisetti Publications

Published : 2016

Edited by :

**L. Ramaiah**

Retd. CIFL (Now known as ESLU)

University Librarian

Price : Rs. 500, \$ 20

# **Philosophical Consequences of Modern Science**

(A Real Case of Academic Torture)

**N. Innaiah**, M.A., Ph.D.

# CONTENTS

PREFACE	3
<b>Part - I</b>	5
<b>ANTITHESIS</b>	7
History of Academic Torture - by M. V. Ramamurthy	
Appendices 1-26	16-101
<b>Part - II</b>	103
<b>THESIS</b>	105
Preface	107
Introduction	108
Chapter - 1	117
Beginning and End	
Chapter - 2	127
Space Time	
Chapter - 3	135
Life - Consciousness - Mind	
Chapter - 4	147
Determinism	
Freedom and Determinism	
- a Reconciliation	

# PREFACE

This is a story of research in the Osmania University. The so called autonomous bodies are not free from redtapism, bureaucracy and partiality. The Osmania University opened its eyes after two judgments from the High Court of Andhra Pradesh. The Andhra Pradesh State Legislature strongly expressed its deep concern about the affair of the University. At last, the degree was awarded after an undue delay of ten years. The University appointed a Disciplinary Committee to inquire into the whole affair. But it is just a formality and an eye - wash. The University is full of vested interests. Naturally, the academic tribe tends to protect and defend its own members. Several professors are repeating and perpetuating the same mistakes. When the High Court gave its verdict in my case, some other research scholars who were helplessly awaiting their degrees got them awarded. The University lost its personal touch. Nobody cares for the individuals. Everybody talks about the "system." A system is like a machine. The person is only a cog in that giant wheel. Let us not confuse impersonal system with the objectivity. No, certainly not. Those who are fortunate enough to get the favours of the professors, can attain Ph.D.s within no time. Some professors are generous enough to write the thesis for their favourite students. Amen!

I am conscious enough, that my thesis is not upto date. But I want to publish it, as it was submitted, in order to keep the record straight and frank.

In my legal fight against the University, especially with the unacademic professor, Mr. N.K. Acharya, advocate stood by me. The whole history was narrated by Mr. M. V. Rama Murty Advocate. In this book, I named the controversial part of the Thesis as Antithesis. Let the reader judge the matter.

INNAlAH

**Part - I**

**ANTITHESIS**

**History  
of  
Academic Torture**

# ANTITHESIS

The facts relating to this Thesis constitute interesting reading. The zigzag turns, the twists all give a touch of drama to the course of the Thesis. Its chequered career is influenced and shaped by acts of well meaning and honest persons as well as by the sly and subtle ways of some others.

Mr. N. Innaiah enrolled himself as a research scholar for Ph.D. degree course of Osmania University in the Department of Philosophy in October, 1965. The topic of research was "The Philosophical Consequences of Modern Science with special reference to the problem of Determinism." (Appendix-1) He had passed the preliminary Ph.D. test held in September, 1966 (Appendix - 2). Mr. Innaiah was then one of the Lecturers in the Philosophy Department of Osmania University. As such, he submitted some research papers. They were commended by his supervisor for publication as articles (Appendix-3). He submitted his Thesis on 3rd October, 1969. He was not informed about the fate of his Thesis even by 22nd June, 1973. Then the scholar wrote a letter to the Vice Chancellor of Osmania University requesting him, for the information (Appendix-4). On 17th December, 1974 he was asked by the Controller of Examinations to revise his Thesis (Appendix-5). He was furnished with extracts from the reports of the Examiners. (Appendix-6). He submitted his revised Thesis on 30th March, 1976 (Appendix. 7).

It is not out of place to refer to something that 'happened prior to March 1976. There was a move to get an Aurobindo University established, by Prof. Madhusudhana Reddy. He is an Aurobindite. It was felt in many circles that he was making strenuous efforts to get an Aurobindo University established.

This gave rise to a tirade against the said move by the rationalists and radical humanists in the form of a press statement (Appendix-8). They wrote a 'Letter to the Editor' in a local English Daily (Appendix-9). This seems to have irked the Aurobindites of Hyderabad. In the meanwhile, a One-man Commission headed by a retired Judge of Andhra Pradesh High Court, Mr.V. Parthasarathi, was appointed to go into the affairs of the University. Naturally, the way the Thesis of Mr N. Innaiah was dealt with, figured as one of the, matters enquired into by the commission. The report of the Commission in respect of the manner in which the Thesis was handled is revealing. It spoke of the entire episode as one of 'wrecked hope' and 'a blasted career.' It stated that one could not part with the case "without being shaken to the core of one's being." Elsewhere in the report it is observed that "it is frustration that grows out of weary years of waiting that enhances or deepens the pathos of the tragedy." The Commission commented that the matter was "muddled through for several months with the inept handling repeating itself in an incredible manner." This evidently referred to the University's delay in taking the necessary action just prior to its directing the candidate on 17th December, 1974 to revise the Thesis. The Commission did not leave the matter without indicating the examination branch of the University by saying "that no one associated with the matter is free from blame." It seems that the report of the Commission was sent to Dr. V Madhusudhana Reddy for comment. Events followed fast. Mr. Innaiah's supervisor and guide Dr. Madhusudhana Reddy tendered his resignation to the post of Professor and Head of Department of Philosophy. The news of this event was reported in the press with the date line of 25th April, 1976. Even this incident created problems for Mr. Innaiah for he was asked to submit the revised Thesis with the certificate from his supervisor. Under the circumstances then prevailing, it was impossible.

Several factors till then unknown to the candidate became known, thanks to the enquiry by the One-man Commission. It seems that at first three examiners were appointed to evaluate the Thesis. They are :

1. Prof. Leo Gabriel of Austria.
2. Dr. Daya Krishna, Jaipur.
3. Dr. V. Madhusudhana Reddy, Supervisor.

While Prof. Leo Gabriel and Dr. V. Madhusudhana Reddy had recommended the award of Ph.D degree, Dr. Daya Krishna had recommended its rejection. The University Syndicate at its 143rd meeting, held on 17th April, 1971, had resolved that the Thesis of Mr. Innaiah be referred to the fourth examiner. The offer was made to three foreign examiners in succession and ultimately it was sent to Prof. Richard Hecking of USA, on 6th July, 1972. Since the report of Prof. Hacking was not received for a long time, Dr. Milick Gapek of Boston University was appointed as examiner. He sent the report in February 1974, stating that the Thesis should be thoroughly revised and resubmitted. The case was submitted to the University Syndicate on 10th June, 1974. It seems that the syndicate has resolved to call upon the candidate to revise the Thesis. The communication of the Syndicate's direction was made on 17th December 1974. Thus it can be seen that it took nearly two years from 17th April, 1971 onwards, for selecting an examiner who could be expected to agree to do the evaluation. Thereafter it took nearly four months for submitting the matter to the Syndicate i.e., from February, 1974 to June, 1974. Yet another six months were allowed to lapse from 10th June, 1974 to 17th December, 1974 to communicate the syndicate's resolution to the candidate. It is this delay that was the subject of adverse comment by the One-man commission headed by Mr. Parthasarathy.

The English daily press reported the news of the report by the Commission and the consequent resignation of the guide. As per Rule 26 (b) of Ph.D. rules of Osmania University, the revised Thesis shall, as far as possible, be referred to the same examiners for their opinion. But this rule was not brought to the notice of the Vice-Chancellor who appointed on 18th May, 1976, the following three teachers as examiners :

1. Prof. K Satchitananda Murthy, Tirupathi
2. Prof. N K Devraj, Varanasi
3. Dr. Barlingay, Poona

The Thesis was sent to the said examiners who submitted the reports. While Dr. K. Satchitananda Murthy recommended the award of Ph.D. degree, Prof. N. K Devraj and Dr. Barlingay, have suggested the revision of the Thesis. On 11th January, 1977 the syndicate passed a resolution to call upon the candidate to revise and resubmit his Thesis in the light of the remarks made by examiners (2) and (3). All these facts are adverted to in the note before the syndicate at its meeting on 4th June, 1977 (Appendix-10). The Dean, Faculty of Arts was requested on 1st March, 1977 to communicate to the candidate that he should revise the Thesis. He was suggested that the reports of the three examiners be communicated to the candidate. Accordingly, on 10th March, 1977, the University sent a note to the candidate calling upon him to revise the Thesis (Appendix-11). The extracts from the reports of the examiners were supplied to him (Appendix-12). On 21st May, 1977 he wrote a letter to the University protesting against the procedure and requesting that he be awarded with the degree of Ph.D. (Appendix-13). The University seemed to have been perplexed by the very irregularities it had been committing and so it was considered by the syndicate at its meeting on 4th June, 1977 It decided to cancel the communication dated 10th March, 1977, directing

revision. It further directed the Controller of Examinations to send the revised Thesis of 30th March, 1976 to Dr. Millic Gaspek of USA, Dr. V.Madhusudhana Reddy and Prof. Leo Gabriel. In June 1977, two copies of the Thesis were sent to Prof. Leo Gabriel and Prof. Gaspek. Prof. Gaspek sent it to his colleague Prof. N. Bhattacharya and the University later acquiesced in it. Prof. Bhattacharya sent his report on 30th March, 1978 to Prof. K J Shah, who was appointed in the place of Prof. Madhusudhana Reddy, who did not reply to the University's communication, he being out of service then, Prof. Shah sent his report on 18th September, 1978. Both the examiners rejected the thesis. All these facts became known when the University filed a counter to the W.P. 476 of 1979, on the file of the Andhra Pradesh High Court (Appendix-14).

On 15th June, 1977, Mr. Innaiah was informed that his representation was under consideration (Appendix-15). Evidently the University did not choose to inform the candidate about the revised Thesis being sent to the original examiners. As time was running fast, as nearly 10 years have elapsed after the candidate's submission of the Thesis on 3rd October, 1969, he became courageous enough to file a Writ Petition No. 476 of 1979 in the High Court of Andhra Pradesh on 19th January 1979, praying for the issue of a writ of mandamus directing the University to constitute a Board of Examiners to conduct the Viva-voce for him in relation to his Thesis (Appendix-16). The University filed the counter earlier referred to as Appendix No-14. The position stood thus – The original Thesis was read by four examiners out of which two have recommended award of the degree; one recommended rejection and one opted for directing revision. The revised Thesis was perused by five examiners out of which one has recommended acceptance, two for rejection and two opined that it needed revision. Thus out of nine Scholars who had the privilege of examining the Thesis

either in the original' form or in the revised form, opinions were expressed as follows. Three examiners recommended acceptance, while another three examiners rejected its worthiness and the remaining three chose to direct revision. Thus it is evident that the matter was not free from doubt. Moreover, one fact became evident that there was a wide difference of opinion between the Austrian school and the American School in respect of the subject itself. This can be inferred from the communication of Dr. Gapek to the University as referred to the counter to WP.476 of 1979 (Appendix-14). Prejudices seemed to have played a vital part in the decision of the examiners who ought to be above these considerations. Apart from that, the University cannot be expected to direct the candidate to revise the Thesis twice, as rules do not permit the same. What all happened after the reports of the original examiners i.e., what happened after 1971 is null and void as being contrary to law and the rules. At any rate, as two out of the three examiners of the First Board recommended acceptance of the candidate's Thesis, it should have been accepted for award of the degree.

Then Mr. Justice Alladi Kuppuswami. directed the University on 6th February, 1980, to consider the position as it obtained in 1971 after the receipt of the reports of the examiners, viz Prof. V. Madhusudhana Reddy, Prof Leo Gabriel of Austria and Prof. Daya Krishna. The Vice-Chancellor was directed to decide within one month whether he should direct the viva-voce examination to be conducted, or the Thesis should be revised or rejected.(Appendix-17). The Court was also pleased to direct that viva-voce should be conducted within two months if the Vice-Chancellor chose to do so.

One would expect smooth sailing thereafter, but alas, it was not so. Mr. Innaiah was called upon by the University by its communication dated 16th April, 1980 to appear for the viva-voce examination on 27th April, 1980. (Appendix-18). He

**End of Preview.**

**Rest of the book can be read @**

**<http://kinige.com/book/Seeker+Of+Scientific+Truth+Volume+1>**

**\* \* \***